

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/612,697	07/02/2003	Kirakodu Nanjundaswamy	DCL2012/M5009	4413
75	90 09/19/2005		EXAM	INER
Barry D. Josep	ohs		WEINER,	LAURA S
Attorney At Lav	W			
19 North St.			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Salem, MA 01	1970		1745	
			DATE MAILED: 00/10/200	_

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

7			,				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
1	10/612,697	NANJUNDASWAMY	YET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
•	Laura S. Weiner	1745					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet with th	e correspondence addr	ress				
Period for Reply							
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply b will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS for a cause the application to become ABANDO	ION.  e timely filed  from the mailing date of this com  DNED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>08 A</u>	uaust 2005.						
	action is non-final.						
·=							
closed in accordance with the practice under E	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>8,10-14 and 16</u> is/are pending in the	annlication	•					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
)⊠ Claim(s) <u>8,10-14 and 16</u> is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	ır.						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	caminer. Note the attached Off	ice Action or form PTC	)-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	9(a)-(d) or (f).					
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:							
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).							
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
Attachment(s)							
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summ						
<ul> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)</li> <li>Paper No(s)/Mail Date</li> </ul>	Paper No(s)/Ma 5) Notice of Inform 6) Other:	al Patent Application (PTO-1	152)				

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Sakurai et al.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. Claims 8, 12-13, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sakurai et al. "Rechargeable Copper Vanadate Cathodes for Lithium Cell".

Sakurai et al. teaches on page 34, a Li/CuV2O6 cell. Sakurai et al. also teaches that the cathode material can be Cu2V2O7. Sakurai et al. teaches on page 32, that the cathode mixtures comprise copper vanadate powder, Ketjen black powder as the conductive diluent and PTFE powder in a weight ratio of 70:27:3 and that the electrolyte comprises LiClO4/PC + 1,2-dimethoxy ethylene (DME). Therefore, Sakurai et al. teaches an electrochemical cell comprising a cathode comprising CuV2O6, an anode comprising lithium and a nonaqueous electrolyte.

While intended use recitations and other types of functional language cannot be entirely disregarded. However, in apparatus, article, and composition claims, intended use must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference

Application/Control Number: 10/612,697

Art Unit: 1745

as compared to the prior art. In re Casey, 370 F.2d 576, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967); In re Otto, 312 F.2d 937, 938, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963).

A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951).

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. Claims 10-11, 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakurai et al. "Rechargeable Copper Vanadate Cathodes for Lithium Cell" in view of Isoyama et al. (6,093,503) or Ilic et al. (5,158,722) or Nakanishi et al. (6,096,234).

Sakurai et al. teaches the claimed invention as explained above but does not teach that the cathode further comprises a manganese dioxide or a lithiated manganese dioxide.

Isoyama et al. teaches in column 5, lines 20-35, that the positive electrode material includes carbon materials, metal oxide materials and conductive polymer materials. Preferably it comprises a metallic compound such as LiMn2O4, LixMnO2, Li2Mn3O4, Cu2V2O7, MnO2, etc. The conductive agent includes carbon materials. Isoyama et al. teaches in column 34, lines 58-61, that the positive active material comprises 90% by weight of metallic compound comprising LiMn2O4 and 6 % by weight

of carbon.

llic et al. teaches in the abstract, positive electrodes for primary and secondary cells wherein the positive active material comprising MnO2, FeS2, CuO, Cu2V2O7 and LixMnOy.

Nakanishi et al. teaches in column 19, lines 30-55, that the positive electrode can contain graphite, MnO2, Cu2V2O7, etc. Nakanishi et al. teaches in column 1, that the battery can be a primary or secondary cells. The active material is added in an amount of 40 wt% to 90 wt%.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use two metallic compounds such as CuV2O6 and MnO2 or CuV2O6 and (LiMn2O4 or LixMnO2 or Li2Mn3O4) in the positive electrode material taught by Sakurai et al. because it is prima facie obvious to combine two compositions each of which is taught by prior art to be useful for the same purpose in order to form a third composition that is to be used for the very same purpose. See *In re Kerkhoven*, 205 USPQ 1069; *In re Susi*, 169 USPQ 423.

4. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakurai et al. "Rechargeable Copper Vanadate Cathodes for Lithium Cell" in view of Fujimoto et al. (5,358,805).

Sakurai et al. teaches the claimed invention as explained above except does not teach that the conductive agent is graphite.

Fujimoto et al. teaches in column 3, that it is known that the positive electrode

Art Unit: 1745

comprises an active material such s LiMn2)3, MnO2, etc. and mixed with a binder and a conductive agent such as Ketjen Black, graphite etc.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use graphite instead of Ketjen Black as the conductive agent in the battery taught by Sakurai because Fujimoto et al. teaches that graphite is known to be a conductive agent and one would expect similar results.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laura S. Weiner whose telephone number is 571-272-1294. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (6:30-4:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Ryan can be reached on 571-272-1292. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Laura S Wéiner Primary Examiner Art Unit 1745